

---

**Centre for Islamic Studies at SOAS**

---

An Early Muṣḥaf According to the Reading of Ibn ‘Āmir / رماع نبا ةءارق ب ركبم تقو نم فحصم

Author(s): Yasin Dutton and نوتاد نيساي

Source: *Journal of Qur’anic Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2001), pp. 71-89

Published by: Edinburgh University Press on behalf of the Centre for Islamic Studies at SOAS

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25728018>

Accessed: 20-08-2016 00:28 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Centre for Islamic Studies at SOAS, Edinburgh University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Qur’anic Studies*

# An Early *Muṣḥaf* According to the Reading of Ibn ʿĀmir

Yasin Dutton

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

The recent publication of the facsimile edition of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Arabe 328a by François Déroche and Sergio Noja Nosedà<sup>1</sup> has made accessible to the general reader what is probably one of the earliest Qurʾanic manuscripts in the libraries of Europe. Written in the script known as Ḥijāzī, or *māʿil*,<sup>2</sup> this manuscript is dated by Déroche and others to the early 8th century AD, i.e. around the turn of the 1st century AH, although some authorities have expressed doubt about such an early date.<sup>3</sup>

MS Paris, BN, Arabe 328a is particularly interesting in that, although by no means a complete copy of the Qurʾan, it nevertheless contains seven extensive, continuous portions of the text, namely:

- (i) Q.2:275–3:43 (ff. 1–3)
- (ii) Q.3:84–5:33 (ff. 4–22)
- (iii) Q.6:20–8:25 (ff. 23–40)
- (iv) Q.9:66–10:77 (ff. 41–48)
- (v) Q.12:84–15:87 (ff. 49–54)
- (vi) Q.35:13–41 (f. 55)
- (vii) Q.38:66–39:15 (f. 56).

There is thus enough material here to give a good, overall impression of the nature of the *muṣḥaf* and, in particular, enough material to be able to ascertain the reading represented.

As is usual for early Qurʾanic manuscripts in *māʿil* or Ḥijāzī script, no vowels (*naḳṭ*) are given, and diacritical points (*iʿjām*) only very rarely,<sup>4</sup> and thus such details of the reading cannot be ascertained. However, there is, of course, the consonantal outline of the text and, in a series of fragments as extensive as these, there are, fortunately, enough consonantal variants to enable a precise ascertainment of the reading, which, as will be demonstrated shortly, accords remarkably well with that of Ibn ʿĀmir (d. 118/736),<sup>5</sup> the chief Qurʾan-reader of Damascus in his day and one of the Seven Readers chosen by Ibn Mujāhid (d. 324/926) in his *Kitāb al-sabʿa fī ʾl-qirāʾāt*,<sup>6</sup> and thus one of those whose reading has been and is accepted by the Muslims up until today as a valid *mutawātir* reading of the Qurʾan. This assessment is based on the

thirteen substantive consonantal variants<sup>7</sup> that occur within the portions of text covered by the manuscript,<sup>8</sup> six of which are uniquely associated with the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, and all of which are consistent with his reading as detailed in the books dealing with *qirāʾāt*, such as Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-sabʿa* (Seven Readings), Ibn Mihrān's (d. 381/991) *Mabsūṭ*<sup>9</sup> and Ibn al-Jazarī's (d. 833/1429) *Nashr*<sup>10</sup> (Ten Readings), al-Bannā's (d. 1117/1705) *Ithāf fuḍalā' al-bashar*<sup>11</sup> (Fourteen Readings), and others.

In the following paragraphs we give details of these thirteen variants, relying on the four above-mentioned books for knowledge of the different readings (of which, for the present purposes, fourteen are assumed). For the sake of simplicity, references to the facsimile edition of the manuscript are by folio rather than page number, as the folio numbers are clearly indicated in the printed edition. It should, however, be noted that all references to Qur'anic verses in these paragraphs assume the Kufan system of verse-numbering in common use today, although this is often not appropriate for this particular manuscript. (We shall return to a consideration of the actual verse-numbering system used in this manuscript later in this article.)

1. Q.3:133 (f. 6a, l. 7): *sāriʿū*, without an initial *wāw*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir and the two Madinans (Abū Jaʿfar and Nāfiʿ), “and thus it is in the *muṣḥafs* of Madina and Syria (*al-Shām*)”, rather than *wa-sāriʿū*, with an initial *wāw*, which is the reading of the others, “and that is how it is in the *muṣḥafs* of Makka and Iraq”.<sup>12</sup>

2. Q.3:184 (f. 8b, l. 21): *wa-bi 'l-zuburi wa-'l-kitābi 'l-munīr*, with a *bā'* before *al-zubur*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, and, Ibn Mihrān tells us, “This is how I have seen it in the *muṣḥafs* of Syria”.<sup>13</sup> Ibn Mihrān also notes that some people have related *bi-'l-zuburi wa-bi-'l-kitāb*, with a *bā'* in both cases from the people of Syria, but that the people of Syria do not accept this and consider it to be a clear mistake, to which he adds: “I have looked carefully at their *muṣḥafs* and have seen *al-kitāb* without a *bā'* and *bi-'l-zuburi* with a *bā'*.”<sup>14</sup>

3. Q.4:66 (f. 14b, l. 1): *illā qalīlan minhum*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, and “thus it is in the *muṣḥafs* of Syria and the *muṣḥaf* of Anas, may Allah have mercy on him, with an *alif*”, whereas the rest read *illā qalīlun minhum*.<sup>15</sup>

4. Q.6:32 (f. 23a, l. 23): *wa-la-dāru 'l-ākhirati*, with one *lām* before the *dāl*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, “and thus it is in the *muṣḥafs* of the people of Syria”, whereas the others read *wa-la 'l-dāru 'l-ākhiratu*, with two *lāms* in front of the *dāl*, “and thus it is in their *muṣḥafs*”.<sup>16</sup>

5. Q.6:63 (f. 24b, l. 16): *la-'in anjaytanā*, with three “teeth”, representing a *yā'*, a *tā'* and a *nūn*, between the *jīm* and the final *alif*, which is the reading of all the non-Kufans, “and thus it is in their *muṣḥafs*”. (The Kufans read *anjānā*, represented by only two “teeth” between the *jīm* and the *alif*, i.e. the first representing a *yā'*, for *alif*

*maqṣūra* – and pronounced with *imāla* by all the Kufans except ʿĀṣim – and the second a *nūn*).<sup>17</sup>

6. Q.6:138 (f. 28a, l. 8): *shurakā'ihim*, written with what is presumed to have been an original *yā'* as a bearer of the *hamza*, and thus indicative of the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, as opposed to *shurakā'uhum*, with a *wāw* as a bearer of the *hamza*, which is the reading of the rest.<sup>18</sup> It should be noted in this instance that, although no *yā'* is actually visible in the manuscript as we have it at present, there is clearly no *wāw* after the *alif* either. Furthermore, there is a gap at this point in the line, which is not the case in other instances of the same word,<sup>19</sup> and it looks very much as if there was an original *yā'* there which was later rubbed out. Whether or not this is the case, the absence of a *wāw* – and of the space necessary for one – suggests greater inconsistency with the reading of the majority than with that of Ibn ʿĀmir.

7. Q.7:2 (f. 30a, l. 14): *yatadhakkarūna*, with two initial “teeth”, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, as opposed to either *tadhdhakkarūna* (the Ḥijāzīs, the Basrans, Shuʿba from ʿĀṣim, and, presumably, al-Aʿmash) or *tadhakkarūna* (Ḥaṣṣ from ʿĀṣim, Ḥamza, al-Kisāʾī and Khalaf), in both cases with only one initial “tooth”.<sup>20</sup>

8. Q.7:43 (f. 31b, l. 24): *mā kunnā li-nahtadiya*, without an initial *wāw*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, “and thus it is in the *muṣḥafs* of the people of Syria”, as opposed to *wa-mā kunnā li-nahtadiya*, with an initial *wāw*, which is the reading of the others.<sup>21</sup> It should be noted, however, that in this instance there is a *wāw* written above the main line of the text between the *alif* at the end of the preceding *li-hādhā* and the *mīm* of *mā*. However, the fact that this *wāw* is above the line, and that the spacing between the *alif* of *li-hādhā* and the *mīm* of *mā* is the same as that at any other word- or word-cluster boundary, seems to me to be a clear indication that the *wāw* is additional, and that the original text was intended to be read *li-hādhā: mā kunnā...* etc, without the *wāw*.

9. Q.7:75 (f. 33b, l. 1): *wa-qāla 'l-mala'u*, with the initial *wāw*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, and how it is written “in the *muṣḥafs* of the people of Syria”, as opposed to *qāla 'l-mala'u*, without the initial *wāw*, which is the reading of the rest.<sup>22</sup>

10. Q.7:141 (f. 36a, l. 2): *wa-idh anjākum*, with one “tooth” marking the *yā'* for the *alif maqṣūra* in *anjā*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, as opposed to *anjaynākum*, with two “teeth” marking the *yā'* and the *nūn*, which is the reading of the rest.<sup>23</sup>

11. Q.9:100 (f. 43a, l. 9): *tajrī taḥtahā*, which is the reading of everyone except the Makkans Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Muḥayṣin, who read *tajrī min taḥtiḥā*, with *min*, which is how it is “in the *muṣḥafs* of Makka”.<sup>24</sup>

12. Q.9:107 (f. 43b, l. 2): *alladhīna 'ttakhadhū*, without an initial *wāw*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir and the two Madinans, “and thus it is in the *muṣḥafs* of the

people of Madina and Damascus”, rather than *wa 'lladhīna 'ttakhadhū*, with the initial *wāw*, which is the reading of the others.<sup>25</sup>

13. Q.10:22 (f. 46a, l. 6): *yanshurukum*, with a single “tooth” for the *nūn* followed by three smaller “teeth” for the *shīn*, which is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, Abū Jaʿfar and al-Ḥasan, as opposed to *yusayyirukum*, with the order of these “teeth” reversed, which is the reading of the others.<sup>26</sup>

None of the other thirty-eight distinctive consonantal variants (see n. 8 above) are present in this particular set of fragments.

From the above it can be seen that at least six of the thirteen variants (i.e. Nos. 2, 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10) are specific to, and thus diagnostic of, the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir; two others (i.e. Nos. 6 and 8) are almost definitely indicative of the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir, although with a slight question-mark over this assumption; and the other five (i.e. Nos. 1, 5, 11, 12 and 13), while not so distinctive, are nevertheless consistent with the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir. It is thus with considerable confidence that we can say that this *muṣḥaf* was written according to the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir.

### Verse-numbering

There is a further feature of interest in this connection, and that is the verse-numbering. Traditional sources on this subject divide the various systems into seven main divisions: Kufan, Basran, early Madinan, later Madinan, Makkan, Damascene and Ḥimṣī.<sup>27</sup> When the Kufan and Basran systems are the same, they are referred to as the Iraqi system; when the two Madinan and the Makkan systems are the same, they are referred to as the Ḥijāzī or, sometimes, the Ḥaramī system; and when the Damascene and Ḥimṣī systems are the same, they are referred to as the Syrian system. Of these, the one most prevalent today and in use in the majority of printed Qur'ans is that of Kufa, and Déroche, as is to be expected, has indexed the fragments in the facsimile of the present manuscript according to the Kufan numbering-system. However, this system is frequently not the one used in early Qur'anic manuscripts and it is not the one used in the present manuscript, as is clear from the verse-marking: as is normal in most early Qur'anic manuscripts, clusters of five and ten verses are marked here by five- and ten-verse “rosettes” which, in this instance take a rather unsophisticated form of stylised *alifs* with small black dashes around them for the five-verse endings, and small circles with small black dashes around them and a letter of the alphabet written inside them for the ten-verse endings. In addition, single verses are marked by six dashes arranged in three horizontal pairs or, occasionally, three or four single dashes arranged vertically, or six or eight dashes in vertical pairs.<sup>28</sup> These markers thus enable us to build up a picture of which numbering-system is actually in use in the manuscript. The following paragraphs give an indication of the system of verse-numbering used by considering in turn each of the sixteen *sūras* represented.

1. *Sūrat al-Baqara* (Q.2:275–286) (f. 1).

The *alif* at the end of the final verse (f. 1b, l. 22) suggests that the intended numbering here is 285 verses, which is the total number according to the Syrian and Ḥijāzī systems, although one source indicates 284 verses in the Syrian count.<sup>29</sup>

2. *Sūrat Āl-ʿImrān* (Q.3:1–43, 84–200) (ff. 2–3, 4–9).

This *sūra* well illustrates the potential problems with the verse-numbering in this manuscript. Almost all sources are agreed that this *sūra* contains 200 verses, although there is dispute about the exact marking of seven of these.<sup>30</sup>

In the present manuscript, the first five verse-endings marked are:

- (i) *al-raḥīm* (f. 2a, l. 1), i.e. the end of the *basmala*, which is not counted as an *āya* in any system (and may simply be being marked here rather than counted as an *āya*).<sup>31</sup>
- (ii) *wa-anzala ʿal-furqān* (f. 2a, l. 4), which comes mid-way through *āya* no. 4 in the Kufan system.
- (iii) *dhū ʿintiqām* (f. 2a, l. 6), which is the end of *āya* no. 4 in the Kufan system.
- (iv) *wa-lā fi ʿl-samāʾ* (f. 2a, l. 7), which is the end of *āya* no. 5 in the Kufan system. (There is no clear gap for a verse-marker after *al-samāʾ*, but a verse-ending has been marked by what seem to be four or six strokes arranged vertically.)
- (v) *al-ḥakīm* (f. 2a, l. 8), which is the end of *āya* no. 6 in the Kufan system.

From here until the end of the first fragment of this *sūra* (i.e. f. 3b), all the five- and ten-verse markers are consistently one verse behind the Kufan system.

If we look in more detail at these first five *āyas*, we note that *alif-lām-mīm* (Q.3:1), which is considered as an *āya* in the Kufan – and only the Kufan – system, has not been marked (f. 2a, l. 1), whereas *wa-anzala ʿl-furqān* (Q.3:4), which is considered as an *āya* in every system but the Kufan, has been marked (f. 2a, l. 4). Furthermore, *wa-anzala ʿl-tawrāta wa ʿl-injil* (Q.3:3), which is considered as an *āya* in all systems except the Syrian,<sup>32</sup> has not been marked here (f. 2a, l. 3). Together, then, these two features would suggest the Syrian system.

In the second fragment from this *sūra* (Q.3:84–200; ff. 4–9), we find that *hattā tunfiqū mimma tuḥibbūn* (Q.3:92) is marked as an *āya* (f. 4a, l. 15), as is also *maqāmu Ibrāhīm* (Q.3:97; f. 4b, l. 1). The first is considered as an *āya* by the Ḥijāzīs (except for Abū Jaʿfar) and the Damascenes, while the second is considered as an *āya* by the Syrians in general and by Abū Jaʿfar.<sup>33</sup> Again, these two features would suggest a Syrian, or, more specifically, the Damascene, system.

The problem with this second fragment is that the numbering indicated by the rosettes does not always accord with the “actual” numbering. After verse 97, all systems

should agree as there are no disputed verse-endings in the second half of the *sūra*. However, in this manuscript we find that there are two rosettes to indicate 100 verses, one after *kāfirūn* (f. 4b, l. 9 = Q.3:100), which is what one would expect, and one after *mustaqīm* in the following verse (f. 4b, l. 12 = Q.3:101), which is what actually follows on logically from the verses marked as 85 (*yanẓurūn*; f. 4a, l. 8 = Q.3:88), 90 (°*alīm*; f. 4a, l. 16 = Q.3:92, since *mimmā tuḥibbūn* has been counted as *āya* no. 89 here), and 95 (*maqāmu Ibrāhīm*; f. 4b, l. 1 = middle of Q.3:97). From this second 100-verse rosette through to the rosette for 150 verses, which comes after *al-ẓālimīn* (f. 6b, l. 22 = Q.3:151), the numbering of the manuscript is consistently one *āya* behind that of the Kufan system, but then the *alif* indicating verse 155 occurs after only four *āyas* (*ḥalīm*; f. 7a, l. 20 = Q.3:155), from which point the numbering coincides with that of the Kufan system until the end of the *sūra*, which is what one would normally have expected after verse 97. It would thus seem that, although the overall pattern of verse-numbering suggests the Syrian (or, more specifically, Damascene) system, the actual marking of this system has not been done in any systematic or accurate fashion.

### 3. *Sūrat al-Nisā'* (Q.4:1–176; ff. 9b–20b).

According to the traditional sources, this *sūra* contains 175 verses in the Hījāzī and Basran systems, 176 in the Kufan, and 177 in the Syrian, the differences stemming from whether *an taḍillū 'l-sabīl* (Q.4:44) and °*adhāban alīman* (Q.4:173) are considered as verse-endings or not. (The first is considered as an *āya* in the Kufan and Syrian systems; the second only in the Syrian system.)<sup>34</sup> In the present manuscript, which we might expect to represent the Syrian system, there is indeed a suitable space left after *an taḍillū 'l-sabīl* (f. 13a, l. 13) but no verse-marking and no obvious sign of there having been any. However, shortly before, in Q.4:43, the word *sabīlan* has been marked as a full verse-ending, with a suitable gap as well (see f. 12b, l. 7), although this is not accepted as a verse-ending in any of the systems mentioned in the sources, and one can only assume this has been done erroneously in place of (or in addition to?) *an taḍillū 'l-sabīl*. With regard to Q.4:173, there is no such suitable gap after the word *alīman*, but a verse has been marked there by the inclusion of four dashes arranged vertically one above the other (f. 20b, l. 2). To further complicate matters, the overall numbering, as with *Sūrat Āl 'Imrān* above, seems to be confused. Up to and including verse 40, the ten-verse rosettes in the manuscript are, as one would expect, in accord with the Kufan system, although the (presumably erroneous) inclusion of *sabīlan* in verse 34 means that there are actually eleven verses marked between the 30- and 40-verse rosettes. However, after *an taḍillū 'l-sabīl*, which, as we have seen, is supposed to be counted as a verse-ending by both the Kufans and the Syrians, the ten-verse rosettes in the manuscript are consistently one verse behind the Kufan system up until Q.4:151 (marked as 150 in this text; see f. 19b, l. 3). From that point on there is further confusion: what seems to be considered a verse ending at

*ghafūran raḥīman* (Q.4:152; f. 19b, l. 5), and is transcribed by Déroche as one, seems not to be clearly marked as such, although there is certainly a suitably large gap. There are then a further four verse-endings before the next *alif*, marking 155 verses, which occurs after *yaqīnan* (Q.4:157; f. 19b, 19). This “addition” of a verse, however, is offset by there being only four verses between this *alif* and the next ten-verse rosette, which occurs at *ʿadhāban alīman* (Q.4:161; f. 20a, l. 5), so that, where Q.4:151 (in the Kufan numbering) was marked by a ten-verse rosette, Q.4:161 is also marked by a ten-verse rosette. The next *alif* occurs after six verses at *baʿīdan* (Q.4:167; f. 20b, l. 14), followed by a ten-verse rosette after only four verses at *wakīlan* (Q.4:171; f. 20b, l. 24). This is followed by an *alif* at the very end of the *sūra*, although, if we include the four dashes marked after *alīman* in verse 173 (see above), six verses have in fact been marked rather than just five. It could thus be maintained that, in accordance with the Syrian system of numbering, both *an taḍillū ʿl-sabīl* and *ʿadhāban alīman* have been marked, the one by a gap and the other by four vertically arranged dashes, and that this is a representation of the Syrian system. Furthermore, if we also count the gap indicated at *ghafūran raḥīman* (see above) as an *āya*, we then have a total of 177 *āyas* marked, which again indicates the Syrian system. However, the placing of the five- and ten-verse markers is not in accord with this and shows a general inaccuracy which rules out any reliance on it as a clear indication of the actual expectations of the original scribe (assuming that the verse numbering – though not, of course, the gaps – was added by a later hand).

#### 4. *Sūrat al-Māʿida* (Q.5:1–33; ff. 20b–22).

According to the traditional sources, this *sūra* contains 120 *āyas* in the Kufan system, 122 in the Ḥijāzī and Syrian systems, and 123 in the Basran system.<sup>35</sup> In this fragment, the relevant *āyas* about which there is dispute are:

- (i) *bi ʿl-ʿuqūd* (Q.5:1), which is not considered an *āya* in the Kufan system, but is according to the others. It is marked here in the standard way, and with a suitably large gap (f. 20b, l. 15).
- (ii) *wa-yaʿfū ʿan kathīr* (Q.5:15), which is not considered an *āya* in the Kufan system, but is according to the others. The text appears damaged at this point, but there is a suitably large gap after the word *kathīr* (f. 22a, l. 2). (Déroche does not mark a verse-ending here in his transcription.)
- (iii) *fa-innakum ghālibūn* (Q.5:23). Again, there is a suitable gap at this point, which is considered a verse-ending only by the Basrans, but the text seems damaged and no dashes are visible. (As in the previous example, Déroche does not mark a verse-ending here in his transcription.)

The apparent verse-marking here, therefore, seems once again to be inaccurate, or at least inconsistent with the expectations raised by the traditional literature, since one



would expect either both (i) and (ii) to be marked and not (iii) (= Ḥijāzī and Syrian numbering), or, perhaps, all three to be marked (= Basran numbering). One could perhaps argue that the three gaps evident indicate the Basran system, but this is countered by the fact that only the first is clearly marked with dashes.

5. *Sūrat al-Anʿām* (Q.6:20–165; ff. 23–30a).

Again we are faced with an anomaly here. According to the traditional sources, this *sūra* contains 165 *āyas* in the Kufan system, 166 in the Syrian and Basran systems, and 167 in the Ḥijāzī system.<sup>36</sup> In this manuscript, an *alif* at the very end of the *sūra* (f. 30a, l. 8) suggests the Kufan counting of 165 *āyas*, but the absence of marking of *bi-wakīl* in Q.6:66 (f. 24b, l. 22) – which the Kufans accept as an *āya* – as also of any suitable gap to indicate a verse-ending, along with the marking of *kun fa-yakūn* in Q.6:73 (f. 25a, l. 17) and of *ṣirāṭin mustaqīm* in Q.6:161 (f. 29b, l. 21), both of which are discounted as verse-endings by the Kufans, suggests that (a) this *sūra* is not numbered according to the Kufan system, despite the final *alif*, and (b) that, once again, the person responsible for indicating the verse-numbering has not done so in a recognisably systematic fashion.

6. *Sūrat al-Aʿrāf* (Q.7:1–206; ff. 30a–39b).

According to the traditional sources, this *sūra* contains 205 verses in the Basran and Syrian systems, and 206 in the Kufan and Ḥijāzī systems, with differences relating to five verse-endings.<sup>37</sup> In this manuscript, neither *alif-lām-mīm-ṣād* (Q.7:1) nor *taʿūdūn* (Q.7:29), both of which are accepted as verse-endings in the Kufan system, are marked (see ff. 30a, l. 10 and 31a, l. 12), whereas *lahu ʿl-dīn* (in Q.7:29), which is accepted as a verse-ending in the Basran and Syrian systems, is (f. 31a, l. 12). The specifically Ḥijāzī endings of *ḍiʿfan min al-nār* (Q.7:38; f. 31b, l. 13) and either *al-ḥusnā ʿalā Banī Isrāʾīl* or *yustadʿafūn* (both in Q.7:137; f. 35b, ll. 13 and 15) are unmarked. There also seem to be five verses coming after the ten-verse rosette marking 200 verses, thus indicating a total of 205 verses, although there is no obvious *alif* to indicate this.

The above features in this *sūra* are thus consistent with the Syrian (and Basran) numbering system.

7. *Sūrat al-Anfāl* (Q.8:1–25; ff. 39b–40b).

None of the distinctive endings in this *sūra*<sup>38</sup> are present in this particular fragment.

8. *Sūrat al-Tawba* (Q.9:66–129; ff. 41a–44b).

The only verse-ending about which there is dispute in the portion of the *sūra* here represented is at verse 70, where the Ḥijāzīs count *wa-ʿĀdin wa-Thamūd* as an *āya*.<sup>39</sup> It is not marked here (f. 41a, l. 12). A ten-verse rosette at the very end of the *sūra* (f. 44b, l. 19) indicates a count of 130 verses, which accords with the systems of all

except the Kufans (who count only 129 verses). This would again indicate either the Syrian or Basran system.

9. *Sūrat Yūnus* (Q.10:1–77; ff. 44b–48a).

In this fragment neither *lahu 'l-dīn* (Q.10:22) nor *li-mā fī 'l-ṣudūr* (Q.10:57), which are said to be specifically Syrian, are marked, either by dashes or by a gap (see ff. 46a, l. 10 and 48a, l. 1), whereas *min al-shākirīn* (Q.10:22), which is said to be counted by all except the Syrians, is marked (f. 46a, l. 11). This numbering would thus seem to be inconsistent with the Syrian system, but consistent with all other systems.<sup>40</sup> However, al-Jaʿbarī notes an opinion that *lahu 'l-dīn* and *li-mā fī 'l-ṣudūr* are only counted by the Damascenes, with the implication that *min al-shākirīn* is counted by all except the Damascenes (rather than “the Syrians”), which thus allows the possibility of this being according to the Ḥimṣī system.<sup>41</sup>

10. *Sūrat Yūsuf* (Q.12:84–111; ff. 49a–49b).

There is no dispute about the verse-numbering in this *sūra*.<sup>42</sup>

11. *Sūrat al-Raʿd* (Q.13:1–43; ff. 49b–51b).

Our sources agree that this *sūra* contains 43 verses in the Kufan system, 44 in the Ḥijāzī system, 45 in the Basran system, and 47 in the Syrian system.<sup>43</sup> In the present manuscript, both *khalqin jadīd* (Q.13:5) and *wa 'l-nūr* (Q.13:16), which are counted by all except the Kufans, are marked (see ff. 50a, l. 10 and 50b, l. 8). In the latter verse, *wa 'l-baṣīr*, mentioned by al-Jaʿbarī and al-Bannāʾ as a feature of the Damascene system and by ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad as Syrian,<sup>44</sup> is not marked (f. 50b, l. 8). A suitable gap after *wa 'l-bāṭil* in verse 17 (f. 50b, l. 13) suggests the Ḥimṣī system referred to by al-Jaʿbarī and al-Bannāʾ<sup>45</sup> (and is indicated as a verse-ending in Déroche’s transcription, although no actual dashes seem visible from the facsimile), but neither *lahum sūʾu 'l-ḥisāb* (Q.13:18) or *min kullī bāb* (Q.13:23), the first a specifically Syrian feature and the second common to both the Iraqi and Syrian systems, are marked (see ff. 50b, l. 18 and 51a, l. 2). To further enhance the confusion, the verse marked by a ten-verse rosette as verse 40 (*wa-ʿindahu ʿilmu 'l-kitāb* = Q.13:39) is followed three verses later by a five-verse *alif* after *li-man ʿuqbā 'l-dār*, following which the final verse could be considered as either no. 44 (four verses after the ten-verse rosette) or no. 46 (one verse after the five-verse *alif*).

All in all, the verse-numbering in this *sūra* in particular seems inconsistent with any system, let alone a Syrian one.

12. *Sūrat Ibrāhīm* (Q.14:1–56; ff. 51b–53b).

According to ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad and al-Bannāʾ, this *sūra* contains 51 verses in the Basran system, 52 in the Kufan, 54 in the Ḥijāzī, and 55 in the Syrian.<sup>46</sup> However, according to al-Jaʿbarī, it is only the Damascene system that counts 55 verses while

the Ḥimṣī system agrees with the Ḥijāzī in having 54 *āyas*.<sup>47</sup> The relevant *āyas* about which there is dispute are:

- (i) *al-nāsa min al-ẓulumāti ilā 'l-nūr* (Q.14:1; f. 51b, l. 23), and
- (ii) *qawmaka min al-ẓulumāti ilā 'l-nūr* (Q.14:5; f. 52a, l. 4), which are both considered *āyas* in the Ḥijāzī and Syrian systems, and are marked here.
- (iii) *wa-‘Ādin wa-Thamūd* (Q.14:9; f. 52a, l. 12), which is considered an *āya* in the Ḥijāzī and Basran systems, and is not marked here.
- (iv) *bi-khalqin jadīd* (Q.14:19), which is considered an *āya* in the Kufan, early Madinan and Damascene systems (and perhaps the Ḥimṣī system as well),<sup>48</sup> but is not marked here (f. 52b, l. 9).
- (v) *wa-far‘uhā fī 'l-sama’* (Q.14:24), which is considered an *āya* in all except the early Madinan system, and is marked here (f. 52b, 22).
- (vi) *al-layla wa 'l-nahār* (Q.14:33), which is considered an *āya* by everyone except the Basrans,<sup>49</sup> and is marked here (f. 53a, l. 8).
- (vii) *‘ammā ya‘malu 'l-ẓālimūn* (Q.14:42) which is an *āya* according to the Syrian system, and is marked here (f. 53a, l. 22).

Assuming the information in our sources is accurate – and, as is apparent from the above (see n.49), these sources sometimes exhibit a fair amount of confusion – the variants in this *sūra* would seem to indicate a Syrian system of numbering, or more specifically the Ḥimṣī system, if we allow, following al-Ja‘barī and al-Bannā’, that *bi-khalqin jadīd* is not a verse-ending in the Ḥimṣī system. Moreover, there is a ten-verse rosette after *al-qahhār* (Q.14:48; f. 53b, l. 7), after which there are a further four verses to the end of the *sūra*, which would indicate a total of 54 verses, which, as we have noted, may be indicative of the Ḥimṣī system (as well as of the Ḥijāzī system). However, if we count the actual number of verses marked we find that, although 54 verses seem to have been marked, the total number actually comes to 55, which is the number of *āyas* in what is described as either the Damascene, or, more generally, the Syrian system. In fact, this whole *sūra* illustrates the problems with the verse-marking in this manuscript: the first ten-rosette, after *ḥamīd* (Q.14: 8) comes after 10 *āyas* (f. 52a, l. 11), but the second, after *ghalīẓ* (Q.14:17), comes after only 19 (f. 52b, l. 5). The *alif* marking 25 verses in fact comes after another seven verses at *yatad-hakkarūn* (Q.14:25; f. 52b, l. 23), while the following 30-verse marker comes after a further four verses at *al-bawār* (Q.14:28; f. 53a, l. 1). The next *alif* (for 35 verses) comes seven verses later at *al-aṣṇām* (Q.14:35; f. 53a, l. 11), while the next rosette (for 40 verses) comes only three *āyas* later at *fī 'l-samā’* (Q.14:38; f. 53a, l. 18). The next *alif* (for 45 verses) comes seven verses later at *zawāl* (Q.14:44; f. 53b, l. 1), and the last rosette (for 50 verses) comes four *āyas* later at *al-qahhār* (Q.14:48; f. 53b, l. 7), with, as noted above, the whole *sūra* ending four verses later. It is abundantly clear from this and the other examples above, that the system of five- and ten-verse

markers is far from accurately applied in this particular manuscript. However, we can at least say that, whether the *sūra* is actually marked as having 54 or 55 verses, both figures accord with a, if not the, Syrian system.

13. *Sūrat al-Hijr* (Q.15:1–87; ff. 53b–54b).

There is no dispute regarding the number of verses in this *sūra*.<sup>50</sup>

14. *Sūrat Fāṭir* (Q.35:13–41; f. 55a–55b).

Again, there is confusion in our literary sources with regard to the details of the verse-numbering in this *sūra*. Some say that the Syrian and later Madinan systems count 46 *āyas* while everyone else counts 45;<sup>51</sup> others say that it is only the Damascenes among the Syrians who count 46 and that in the Ḥimṣī system there are only 44 verses.<sup>52</sup> As for the *āyas* about which there is dispute, they would seem to number nine altogether, although, once again, our texts exhibit some confusion on this point.<sup>53</sup> However, as the beginning and end of this *sūra* are missing in this fragment, only five of these disputed endings occur here, namely:

- (i) *bi-khalqin jadīd* (Q.35:16), which is considered an *āya* in every system except the Basran and, possibly, the Ḥimṣī,<sup>54</sup> and is not marked here (f. 55a, l. 6).
- (ii) *al-aʿmā wa ʿl-baṣīr* (Q.35:19), and
- (iii) *wa-lā ʿl-nūr* (Q.35:20), both of which are considered *āyas* by everyone except the Basrans, and both of which are marked here, although in the former case there is no large gap after the word *baṣīr* and the six dashes are arranged vertically rather than horizontally (f. 55a, l. 11, for both).
- (iv) *fī ʿl-qubūr* (Q.35:22), said to be considered an *āya* either by everyone except the Damascenes<sup>55</sup> or by everyone except the Syrians.<sup>56</sup> Here there is clearly a suitably large gap for an *āya* break, but no obvious signs of any dashes (see f. 55a, l. 14).
- (v) *illā nadhīr* (Q.35:23), said to be considered an *āya* in all systems except that of Ḥimṣ.<sup>57</sup> It is marked here (f. 55a, l. 14).

From the above, it would seem from nos. (i), (ii) and (iii), taken together, that the system being used is described in the sources as being that of Ḥimṣ. However, while no. (iv) could be interpreted as supporting the Ḥimṣī system in that a verse-gap is clearly evident, no. (v), which implies a non-Ḥimṣī system, would seem to militate against this understanding. Once again, we seem to have clear “Syrian” features, but nothing that could be considered a consistent marking of the same.

15. *Sūrat Ṣād* (Q.38:66–88; f. 56a).

According to the sources, this *sūra* contains 85 verses in the Basran system (or, according to al-Jaʿbarī and al-Bannāʾ, that of al-Jahḍarī among the Basrans), 86 in the Ḥijāzī and Syrian systems (and also, according to al-Jaʿbarī and al-Bannāʾ, that of

Ayyūb among the Basrans), and 88 according to the Kufans.<sup>58</sup> Here the *sūra* seems to be marked as having 85 *āyas*, since, although there is no *alif*-marker as such at the end of the final *āya*, there is what looks like a small square of dots with a slight tail at the top right, in addition to which this *āya* comes five verses after the rosette marking 80 verses. According to al-Jaʿbarī and al-Bannāʾ, *nabaʿun ʿaẓīm* (Q.38:67) is counted as an *āya* by everyone except the Ḥimṣīs, while *wa ʿl-ḥaqqā aqūl* (Q.38:84) is counted as an *āya* by the Kufans, the Ḥimṣīs, and Ayyūb among the Basrans.<sup>59</sup> As neither are marked in the present manuscript (see f. 56a, ll. 2 and 15), there might seem to be a major inconsistency here, since the former suggests the Ḥimṣī system while the latter denies it. However, in Umar ibn Muḥammad's *ʿAdd al-āy* we find that the ending *nabaʿun ʿaẓīm* is not even mentioned and that *wa ʿl-ḥaqqā aqūl* is considered as an *āya* only by the Kufans, which at least allows for consistency with what is presumably considered to be the Syrian system in that source. Having said which, the total of 85 verses suggests the numbering of the Basrans, or at least of al-Jahḍarī among them, rather than that of any Syrian system, which leaves us again with our inconsistencies.

#### 16. *Sūrat al-Zumar* (Q.39:1–15; f. 56a–56b).

Three disputed verse-endings<sup>60</sup> occur in the portion of the *sūra* represented here:

- (i) *fthi mukhtalifūn* (Q.39:3), which is considered an *āya* by all but the Kufans, and is marked here (f. 56a, l. 25);
- (ii) *mukhlīṣan lahu ʿl-dīn* (Q.39:11), which is considered an *āya* by the Kufans and the Damascenes, and is not marked here (f. 56b, l. 24);
- (iii) *lahu dīnī* (Q.39:14), which is considered an *āya* by the Kufans, and is not marked here (f. 56b, l. 27).

From these three one can only say that the system being used is clearly not Kufan, and presumably not that of Damascus either.

### Conclusion

At one point in his Introduction, Déroche questions whether “the rigorous norms which regulated the practice of copyists” were imposed right from the beginnings of the written tradition in the middle of the 1st/7th century: “nothing”, he says, “is less certain”.<sup>61</sup> It would seem from the above, however, that we already have at the time of this manuscript (whenever that may be) a very accurate portrayal—at least as far as the consonantal outline of the text is concerned—of one of the readings later to be declared indisputably *mutawātir* by Ibn Mujāhid in the 4th/11th century, namely, that of Ibn ʿĀmir. At the same time the inaccuracies in the verse-numbering suggest a very different approach to that aspect of the manuscript tradition—at least, for this particular manuscript.<sup>62</sup> Thus while the accuracy of the early textual tradition is given great credibility by this find, as also the literary tradition associated with the science of Qurʾanic

readings, the same cannot be said for the numbering system employed, which, as we have seen, manifests a large number of inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies.

The two main questions about such a manuscript, though, will remain those of date and provenance. As far as the second is concerned, Ibn Mujāhid notes that Ibn ʿĀmir's reading was the dominant reading amongst the people of "Syria and the Jazīra" (i.e. the Levant and Upper Mesopotamia) in his day,<sup>63</sup> while Ibn al-Jazarī says that it continued to be the reading used by the people of Syria "up until around the year 500", at which time it was replaced by the reading of Abū ʿAmr.<sup>64</sup> One thus feels justified in saying that this manuscript almost definitely originated somewhere in this region. This would seem to be the obvious presumption from the reading, and, although the verse-numbering is not, as we have seen, altogether conclusive, it does seem as if, despite the inconsistencies, there is some sort of "Syrian" stamp to it, which at least ties it in with the Syrian nature of the reading. This also enables us to confirm the perhaps obvious point that "Ḥijāzī" script should not be understood to refer geographically only to the Ḥijāz.<sup>65</sup>

As for the question of date, Déroche states that the Ḥijāzī script "was certainly employed for copying the Qur'an in the 7th century AD and may have continued to be used in the 8th", adding that it illustrates "the first stage in the history of Qur'anic calligraphy".<sup>66</sup> He also accepts that the use of parchment and a vertical format are generally indications of an early date, although this does not preclude the possibility that (a) some horizontal format Qur'ans are also early, and (b) that some "Ḥijāzī" Qur'ans also date from a later period.<sup>67</sup> Indeed, he is prepared to date our present manuscript, as we saw at the beginning of this article, to the early 8th century. If, however, we accept that such vertical-format "Ḥijāzī" Qur'ans are generally earlier than the horizontal-format "Kufic" Qur'ans common in the 2nd-4th centuries AH (which Déroche prefers to refer to as "Abbasid" since most of them derive from that period),<sup>68</sup> and if we further accept that the "Kufic" (or "Abbasid") scripts exhibited by these Qur'ans were already being used in the latter part of the Umayyad period at the beginning of the 2nd or even end of the 1st century AH (e.g. MS Sanaa, Dār al-Makḥṭūṭāt, 20–33.1 [see n. 3 above], which is in a standard "Abbasid" script akin to Déroche's Type C.I), then we are left with some interesting possibilities: the *muṣḥaf* represented by MS Arabe 328a might not only date from the latter part of Ibn ʿĀmir's (d. 118/736) life, but also, conceivably, to an earlier period closer to the time of ʿUthmān's promulgation of a "standard" text (albeit with some regional variations), before "Kufic" scripts such as Déroche's C.I began to be commonly used – assuming that such "Kufic" scripts did only develop later, after the "Ḥijāzī" ones. In other words, if "Kufic" scripts developed after "Ḥijāzī" ones, and some "Kufic" scripts were already in use in the second half of the Umayyad period, then some "Ḥijāzī" scripts must date from an earlier period, including, as von Bothmer suggests, the first

half of the 1st century AH.<sup>69</sup> The present manuscript could thus conceivably be a Syrian copy made from, or close to the time of, one of the ʿUthmānī originals, rather like the copy possessed by Mālik (d. 179/795) that his grandfather had written “at the time when ʿUthmān wrote the *muṣḥafs*”.<sup>70</sup> At the very least it would seem reasonable to assume that it was a copy made in Syria during Umayyad times, which, put differently, means that it was a copy made in Syria at the time when the seat of the caliphate was in Syria – which could prove to be significant if questions of cost and patronage are at issue.

If, on the other hand, Ibn ʿĀmir’s reading was not really fixed until the time of those later considered as the main *rāwīs* from him, i.e. Hishām (d. c. 245/859) and Ibn Dhakwān (d. 242/856),<sup>71</sup> then this could simply be a late (i.e. Abbasid) example of a parchment, vertical-format, Ḥijāzī manuscript, as suggested by Déroche’s caveat above.

As for the anomalous verse-numbering, an early date could help to explain this too. Since the Qurʾan was in its early stages primarily a “spoken” document, and since one can expect the possible stopping-places (*waqafāt*) to have been far more fluid in a spoken text than the actual words, then it makes sense that an early manuscript such as the present one should exhibit a much more anomalous numbering-system, with numerous inconsistencies, than later copies. Indeed, that regional norms of verse-numbering were not set until some time in the second century AH – in Syria, at least – and that this manuscript therefore predates that time, is suggested by the attribution of the Damascene system to Ibn ʿĀmir (d. 118/736) and Yaḥyā al-Dhamārī (d. 145/762), and of the Ḥimṣī system to Shurayḥ (Abū Ḥaywa) (d. 203/818).<sup>72</sup> By contrast, the reading – or at least its consonantal representation – is, as we have seen, remarkably consistent with one of the known *mutawātīr* readings. Perhaps the possibility should also be borne in mind that this was a private copy (as with Mālik’s grandfather’s above) and that, although the main text was correctly copied, less care was taken with the verse-numbering, either because it was less important, or perhaps because, as suggested above, there was simply less knowledge about it and regional norms had not yet been fixed.

It is of course dangerous to generalise from one specific instance, and even more so when there is a fair measure of speculation thrown in, but one hopes that, with the continued publication of facsimiles such as the present one, further details will come to light which will enable us to build up a clearer picture of the earliest stages in the textual history of the Qurʾan.

## NOTES

1 François Déroche and Sergio Noja Nosedá (eds.), *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte coranique. I. Les manuscrits de style ḥijāzī. Volume 1. Le manuscrit arabe 328 (a) de la Bibliothèque nationale de France* (Fondazione Ferni Noja Nosedá, Leda, and Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, 1998. ISBN 88–87281–00–9). I am grateful to Dr. Colin Baker of the British Library, London, for allowing me access to a copy of this book before it had been catalogued by the Library.

2 Déroche draws a fine distinction between these two terms: “Ḥijāzī” scripts where the characteristic sloping *alif* has a return at the base (as in our present manuscript), he designates as Hijāzī I, while similar scripts where the same sloping *alif* has no return at the base (as in British Library MS Or. 2165, illustrated, for example, in Nabia Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and Its Kurʿānic Development* [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1939], Plate VI, no. 1), he designates as Hijāzī II, which, he says, “is more generally known as *māʿil*” (see François Déroche, *The Abbasid Tradition: Qurʾans of the 8th to the 10th Centuries A.D.* [London and Oxford: The Nour Foundation, in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press, 1992], p. 28). Others, however, consider both terms to refer effectively to the same thing (e.g. Gerd-R. Puin, “Observations on Early Qurʾan Manuscripts in Ṣanʿāʾ”, in Stefan Wild [ed.], *The Qurʾan as Text* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996], p. 108).

3 See Déroche, *Abbasid Tradition*, p. 32, Cat. 1, referring to a single folio from the same *muṣḥaf* in the Nasser David Khalili Collection in London (Accession No. KFQ60). Levi della Vida was also prepared to accept that the single folio in the Vatican Library from the same *muṣḥaf* (MS Vat. Ar. 1605) was one of the oldest Qurʾanic fragments known, and thus could well date from the second half of the 1st century AH, although he acknowledged that such an early date was “not unanimously accepted by scholars” (see Giorgio Levi della Vida, *Frammenti Coranici in Carattere Cufico nella Biblioteca Vaticana. Codici Vaticani Arabi 1605 e 1606* [Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1947], p. 2, also vii–ix). Similar “Ḥijāzī” manuscripts found in the Sanaa collection are dated by von Bothmer to the 1st century AH (see, for example, Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer, “Frühislamische Koran-Illuminationen: Meisterwerke aus dem Handschriftenfund der Grossen Moschee in Sanaa/Yemen”, *Kunst und Antiquitäten*, 1 [1986], p. 25, Plate 3; idem, “Masterworks of Islamic Book Art: Koranic Calligraphy and Illumination in the Manuscripts found in the Great Mosque in Sanaa”, in Werner Daum [ed.], *Yemen: 3000 Years of Art and Civilisation in Arabia Felix* [Innsbruck and Frankfurt/Main: Pinguin-Verlag and Umschau-Verlag, 1987(?)], p. 179). De Slane, however, dated MS Paris, BN, Arabe 328a to the 3rd century AH, basing his assessment on the argument that leaving a space at the beginning of a *sūra* for the title, as occurs in this manuscript, was introduced only at the end of the 2nd century (see M. Le Baron de Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1883–95), p. 90. This latter argument, however, would seem to be very weak, especially in the light of the new discoveries in Sanaa where at least one manuscript (i.e. MS Sanaa, Dār al-Makḥṭūṭat, 20–33.1) dated by von Bothmer to the Umayyad period – and quite possibly, to the reign of al-Walīd ibn ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 86–96/705–715) – clearly displays this feature (see for example, Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer, “Architekturbilder im Koran: Eine Prachthandschrift der Umayyadenzeit aus dem Yemen”, *Pantheon* 45 [1987], pp. 4–20, esp. Plates 10, 11, 14, 15, 17–20, 23, 24; idem, “Frühislamische Koran-Illuminationen”, p. 31, Plate 11; also idem, “Masterworks”, p. 179).

4 Occasionally one finds a number of examples on one folio, e.g. one stroke above the “tooth” for the *nūn* in *minhu* in f. 10a, l. 17; two strokes above the “tooth” for the *tāʾ* in *taraka* and *tarakū* in f. 10a, ll. 16 and 21; and three strokes above the “tooth” for the *thāʾ* in *kathura* in f. 10a, l. 17; but such pointing is very infrequent elsewhere in the manuscript.



5 For Ibn 'Āmir, see, for example, al-Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat al-qurrāʾ al-kibār ʿalāʾl-ṭabaqāt waʾl-ʿaṣār*, ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Jād al-Ḥaqq (2 vols., Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, c. 1969), i. 67–70 (esp. pp. 68 and 69, where he is described as having headed [*raʿasa*] the mosque in Damascus from the time of ʿAbd al-Malik [d. 86/705] onwards); Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ghāyat al-nihāya fī ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, ed. G. Bergsträsser (2 vols., 3rd edn, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1402/1982), i. 423–5.

6 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa fīʾl-qirāʾāt*, ed. Shawqī Dayf (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, c. 1400/1980).

7 By “substantive” we exclude simple spelling variants such as those involving the absence of a medial *alif* in words such as *qāla*, *kitāb*, etc, of which there are many examples in this manuscript. (For this feature in the early manuscripts found in the Great Mosque in Ṣanʿāʾ, see Puin, “Observations”, p. 108).

8 These thirteen variants are culled from the list provided in Bergsträsser’s update of Nöldeke’s *Geschichte des Qorans* (Theodor Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorans, Band III: Die Geschichte des Qorāntexts*, 2nd edn revised by Gotthelf Bergsträsser and Otto Pretzl [Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926–36], 11–14) which in turn is based on al-Dānī’s *Kitāb al-Muqniʿ*, where a total of thirty-eight such variants are listed for the whole of the Qurʾan (see al-Dānī, *Kitāb al-Muqniʿ fī rasm maṣāḥif al-amṣār*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Qamḥāwī [Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyāt al-Azhariyya, n.d.], pp. 106–112).

9 Ibn Mihrān, *al-Mabsūt fīʾl-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, ed. Subayʿ Ḥamza Ḥakīmī (Damascus: Majmaʿ al-Lughā al-ʿArabiyya, ca. 1981).

10 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fīʾl-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, ed. Alī Muḥammad al-Ḍabbāʿ (2 vols., Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.; originally Damascus, 1927).

11 al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf fuḍalāʾ al-bashar fīʾl-qirāʾāt al-arbaʿ ʿashr*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Ḍabbāʿ (Beirut: Dār al-Nadwa al-Jadīda, n.d.; originally Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Abd al-Ḥamid Ḥanafī, 1359 [1940]).

12 See Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 169; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 216; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 106, 113, 114–115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 242; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 179, 185.

13 *Mabsūt*, p. 172. See also Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 221; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 106, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 245; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 183, 185.

14 *Mabsūt*, p. 172. Ibn Ghalbūn (d. 399/1009), in his *Tadhkira*, says that the reading *wa-biʾl-zuburi wa-biʾl-kitāb* is the reading of Hishām (d. c. 244/858), from ʿIrāk ibn Khālid (d. before 200/815), from Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥārith al-Dhamārī (d. 145/762), from Ibn ʿĀmir, whereas *wa-biʾl-zuburi wa-ʾl-kitāb* is the reading of Ibn Dhakwān (d. 242/856), from Ayyūb ibn Tamīm (d. 198/813), from Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥārith al-Dhamārī, from Ibn ʿĀmir (see Ibn Ghalbūn, *al-Tadhkira fīʾl-qirāʾāt al-thamān*, ed. Ayman Rushdī Suwayd [2 vols., Jeddah: al-Jamāʿa al-Khayriyya li-Taḥfīz al-Qurʾān al-Karīm, 1412/1991], ii. 300, also 188). Ibn al-Jazarī, in a long discussion on this point which relies partly on al-Dānī (see *Nashr*, ii. 245–6; cf. al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 106, 115), supports this basic distinction but points out that there is a difference of opinion on Hishām’s reading of this phrase, with almost all transmissions from him via al-Ḥulwānī reading *wa-biʾl-kitāb*, but certain others from him reading *waʾl-kitāb*. Ibn al-Jazarī also notes, again following al-Dānī, that this phrase was written as *wa-biʾl-kitāb* “in the *muṣḥaf* of the people of Ḥimṣ which ʿUthmān sent to the people of Syria”, adding that he himself had seen it that way “in the Syrian *muṣḥaf* in the Umayyad Mosque”. He further notes that “in the *muṣḥaf* of Madina” he had seen the first *bāʾ* (i.e. that in *wa-biʾl-zuburi*) written, but not the second (i.e. that of *wa-biʾl-kitāb*). (For this last point, see also al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, p. 183.)

15 See Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 180; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 235; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 250; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 192, 197.

16 See Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 257; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 256; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 193; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 115; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 207, 221.

17 See Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 259; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, pp. 259–60; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, pp. 195–6; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 116; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 210, 221.

18 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 270; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 203; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 263–5; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 217–18, 221.

19 No other instances of this word show such a gap, although they show slight variations of spelling. Thus, for example, *shurakāʾukum* is spelt with an *alif* and a *wāw* in ff. 23a, l. 4 (Q.6:22), and 46b, l. 9 (Q.10:28); *shurakāʾuhum* is spelt with a *wāw* but no preceding *alif* in f. 46b, l. 10 (Q.10:28); *shurakāʾakum* is spelt simply with an *alif* and no sizeable following gap in ff. 39b, l. 2 (Q.7:195) and 48b, l. 9 (Q.10:71); *shurakāʾinā* is spelt with a *yāʾ* and no preceding *alif* in f. 28a, l. 5 (Q.6:136); *shurakāʾikum* is spelt with an *alif* and a following *yāʾ* in ff. 46b, l. 23 (Q.10:34) and 47a, l. 2 (Q.10:35); and *shurakāʾihim* is spelt with a *yāʾ* and no preceding *alif* in f. 28a, ll. 5 and 6 (Q.6:136). (All of these instances are spelt with an *alif* in standard modern editions.)

20 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 278; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 207; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 267; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 222 (where the four readings beyond the Ten are only implicitly mentioned and not overtly stated), 235.

21 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 280; also: Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 208; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 269; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 224, 235.

22 See al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 107–8, 115; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 284; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 210; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 270; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 226, 235.

23 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 293; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 214; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 108, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 271; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 229, 235.

24 See Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 228; also: Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 317; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 108, 114; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 280; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 244, 246.

25 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 318; also: Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 229; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 108, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 281; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 244, 246.

26 See Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 325; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 233; al-Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, pp. 108, 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, ii. 282; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 248, 254. This is one of the readings that al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf (d. 95/714) is said to have changed in “the *muṣḥaf* of Uthmān”, preferring *yusayyirukum* to *yanshurukum* (see Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Kitāb al-maṣāḥif*, ed. Arthur Jeffrey, in idem, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qurʾān* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1937], Arabic text, p. 49).

27 See, for example, al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, pp. 118–119.

28 For three dashes arranged vertically, see, for example, f. 10a, ll. 15, 18 and 20; for four, ff. 9b (several instances) and 20b, l. 2; for what seem to be six, ff. 2a, l. 7, and 55a, ll. 11 and 26; and for eight, f. 9b, l. 9. For illustrations of the general style of verse-numbering in this manuscript, the reader is also referred to Levi della Vida, *Frammenti*, Plate 1, and Déroche, *Abbasid Tradition*, p. 32, Cat. 1.

29 See al-Jaʿbarī (d. 732/1332), *Ḥusn al-madad fī maʿrifat fann al-ʿadad*, British Library, London, MS Or. 12854/1, f. 16a; al-Bannāʾ, *Ithāf*, p. 125; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 90, n. \*. The figure of 284 verses is given by Abū ʿl-Qāsim ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfī (d. c. 400/1009) (whose information derives, via one intermediary, from the same Ibn Mihrān who is the author of the *Mabsūt*), in his *ʿAdd al-āy fī suwar al-Qurʾān* (= MS British Library, London, Or. 14501, f. 12a). However, this and certain other anomalies in this manuscript cause one to doubt its reliability at times.

30 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 18a; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 169; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 160, n. \*. Umar ibn Muḥammad, however (°Add, f. 14a), says that the Syrians only count 194 verses in this *sūra*.

31 Although the *basmala* seems to have been counted, as well as marked, as an *āya* here, it is clear that in other instances it is not counted, although it is marked (e.g. *Sūrat al-Mā'idā*, *Sūrat al-Anfāl*, *Sūrat Yūnus*, *Sūrat al-Ra'd*, *Sūrat Ibrāhīm*, *Sūrat al-Ḥijr* and *Sūrat al-Zumar*). In two instances (*Sūrat al-Nisā'* and *Sūrat al-A'rāf*), the *basmala* is not given a verse-marker at all. (Puin notes ["Observations", p. 110] that, in some of the "Ḥijāzī" fragments found in Ṣan'ā', "the *Basmalas* at the outset of the *Sūras* are always marked by a verse separator.")

32 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 18a; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 169; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 160, n. \*.

33 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 18a-b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 169; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 160, n. \*.

34 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 15a; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 19b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 185; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 175, n. \*.

35 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 16a; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 20b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 197; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 184, n. \*.

36 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 17a; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 21b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 205; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 191, n. \*.

37 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 18a; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 22b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 222; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 207, n. \*.

38 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 19a-b; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 24a; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 235; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 220, n. \*.

39 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 19b; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 24b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, pp. 239–40; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 225, n. \*.

40 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 20b; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 25b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 246; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 231, n. \*.

41 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 25b.

42 See, for example, al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 261; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 244, n. \*.

43 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 23a; al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 27b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 269; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 251, n. \*.

44 For references, see previous note.

45 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 27b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 269.

46 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 23b; al-Bannā', *Iṭḥāf*, p. 271; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 256, n. \*.

47 See al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 28a.

48 Al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī (*Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 28a) and al-Bannā' (*Iṭḥāf*, p. 271) say "early Madinan, Kufan and Damascene", whereas °Umar ibn Muḥammad (°Add, f. 23b) says "Kufan, Syrian and Yazid [i.e. Abū Ja<sup>c</sup>far = early Madinan]".

49 See °Umar ibn Muḥammad, °Add, f. 23b; Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 256, n. \*. In al-Ja<sup>c</sup>barī's *Ḥusn al-madad* (f. 28a) the relevant text reads "«*wa-far'u-hā fi 'l-samā'*» *ghayr al-awwal wa-ghayr Baṣrī*, «*al-layla wa'l-nahār*» *wa-Shāmī* [sic], «*ammā ya'malu 'l-ḡālimūn*»", while in al-Bannā's *Iṭḥāf* (p. 271) it reads "«*wa-far'u-hā fi 'l-samā'*» *ghayr awwal wa-ghayr Baṣrī*, «*wa-sakhhkharu lakumu 'l-layla wa'l-nahār*» *Shāmī*, «*ammā ya'malu 'l-ḡālimūn*» *Shāmī*", both of which texts seem to exhibit clear corruption. If we compare these references with °Umar ibn

Muḥammad's *ʿAdd al-āy* and Ibn Mihrān's *Mabsūt* it becomes clear that the text in both cases should in fact read something like «*wa-farʿu-hā fī 'l-samā'*» *ghayr [al-Jawwal, «[wa-sakkhara lakumu] 'l-layla wa'l-nahār» ghayr Baṣrī, «ammā yaʿmalu 'l-ẓālimūn» Shāmī*».

50 See, for example, al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 274; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 259, n. \*.

51 See ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *ʿAdd*, f. 37a. Cf. Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 366, n. \*.

52 See al-Jaʿbarī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 40a; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 361.

53 ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad (*ʿAdd*, f. 37a) says “seven”, but only mentions six; al-Bannā' (*Ithāf*, p. 361), says “seven”, but then seems to mention nine (a confusion between the numbers “seven” [*sabʿ*] and “nine” [*tisʿ*] in Arabic is of course easily explained by their orthographic similarities); al-Jaʿbarī (*Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 40a) says “nine” and mentions nine. Cf. Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 366, n. \*, who mentions six disputed endings without, of course, mentioning those that are specific to the (or a) Syrian system.

54 ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad (*ʿAdd*, f. 37a) mentions this as being counted by all except the Basrans. Al-Jaʿbarī (*Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 40a) and al-Bannā' (*Ithāf*, p. 361), mention it as being counted by all except the Basrans and the Ḥimṣīs.

55 al-Jaʿbarī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 40a; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 361.

56 ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *ʿAdd*, f. 37a.

57 al-Jaʿbarī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 40a; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 361. Cf. ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *ʿAdd*, f. 37a, where this possible ending is not mentioned.

58 See ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *ʿAdd*, f. 39a; al-Jaʿbarī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, ff. 41b-42a; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 371. Cf. Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 380, n. \*.

59 This is the view of al-Jaʿbarī (*Ḥusn al-madad*, ff. 41b-42a) and al-Bannā' (*Ithāf*, p. 371). ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad (*ʿAdd*, f. 39a) simplifies the position by not specifically mentioning either the Ḥimṣīs or an “Ayyūbid” position among the Basrans. For this “simplified” Basran position, see also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 380, n. \*.

60 For these, see ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *ʿAdd*, f. 40a; al-Jaʿbarī, *Ḥusn al-madad*, f. 42b; al-Bannā' *Ithāf*, p. 374; also Ibn Mihrān, *Mabsūt*, p. 383, n. \*.

61 Déroche and Noja Nosedá, *Le manuscrit arabe 328 (a)*, p. xvii.

62 Puin notes (“Observations”, p. 110), with regard to the verse-numbering of the Ṣanʿā' manuscripts, that there is often “no thorough correspondence with any of the ... traditional systems”.

63 Ibn Mujāhid, *Sabʿa*, p. 87.

64 Ibn al-Jazārī, *Ghāya*, i. 424, 292; also idem, *Nashr*, ii. 264.

65 Cf. Déroche and Noja Nosedá, *Le manuscrit arabe 328 (a)*, p. xxiv, n. 18.

66 Déroche, *Abbasid Tradition*, pp. 28, 32.

67 Déroche and Noja Nosedá, *Le manuscrit arabe 328 (a)*, p. xiii.

68 Déroche, *Abbasid Tradition*, p. 34.

69 See von Bothmer, “Masterworks”, p. 179.

70 See Ibn Rushd al-Jadd, *al-Bayān wa'l-taḥṣīl wa'l-sharḥ wa'l-tawjīh wa'l-taʿlīl li-mā fī masāʾil al-Mustakhrāja*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥajjī (20 vols., 2nd edn, Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1408/1988), xviii. 275 (also xvii. 33); al-Dānī, *Muqni*, p. 116.

71 For these two *rāwīs*, see, for example, Ibn Ghalbūn, *Tadhkira*, i. 25–29; Ibn al-Jazārī, *Nashr*, i. 135–146; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 7.

72 See al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 119.